



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,511	04/20/2004	Edmond Glen Chenier		4292

7590 05/06/2005
Edmond Glen Chenier
1216 Brook Drive
Allen, TX 75002

EXAMINER

LE, MARK T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3617

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10, 828, 511



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

05032005


DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

An Interview Summary including the following attachments:

- 3 pages faxed from Mr. Chenier.
- 1 page Amendment Proposal


Mark T. Le
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3617
5/3/05

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/828,511	Applicant(s) CHENIER, EDMOND GLEN	
	Examiner Mark T. Le	Art Unit 3617	

All Participants:

 (1) Mark T. Le.

 (2) Edmond Glen Chenier.
Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 2 May 2005
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1-3

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Chenier informally proposed new claims 1-8 for consideration. See the attached proposal faxed to the examiner on 4/27/05. In response, the examiner indicated that said claims would not place the application in condition for allowance. To assist Mr. Chenier, the examiner offered new claims 4-6 (see the attachment) to replace original claims 1-3 so as to place the instant application in a better condition for allowance. In response, Mr. Chenier accepted the examiner's proposal. .